DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 736 CS 201 341

AUTHOR Hoetker, James; Robb, Richard
TITLE The "Place of Drama" Questionnaire.
PUB DATE 67
NOTE 34p.; Reprinted from "Research in the Teaching of English," Fall 1969; See related documents CS 201 320-375

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Drama; *Educational Research; English Instruction; Language Arts; *Measurement Instruments; Research Tools; Resource Materials; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *The Research Instruments Project; TRIP

ABSTRACT

Designed to assess teachers" attitudes toward a variety of objectives for teaching drama, the "Place of Drama" questionnaire contains 32 items. A principal component factor analysis of results from a large-scale tryout yielded the following categories among the items: noncognitive personal development, ethical growth, literary knowledge, improvement of taste and behavior, curricular utility, theater-specific knowledge, transfer of skills, enjoyment, and art appreciation. Eight categories were devised to cover the range of objectives for drama, and then four groups in the study--English teachers, actors, administrators, and drama teachers--sorted the objectives into the categories with rather high agreement (85 percent in one sorting), confirming their usefulness and appropriateness. [This document is one of those reviewed in The Research Instruments Project (TRIP) monograph "Measures for Research and Evaluation in the English Language Arts" to be published by the Committee on Research of the National Council of Teachers of English in cooperation with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. A TRIP review which precedes the document lists its category (Teacher Competency), title, authors, and date, and describes the instrument's purpose and physical characteristics.] (JM)

NCTE Committee on Research

The Research Instruments Project (TRIP)

ED 091736

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The attached document contains one of the measures reviewed in the TRIP committee monograph titled:

Measures for Research and Evaluation
in the English Language Arts

TRIP is an acronym which signifies an effort to abstract and make readily available measures for research and evaluation in the English language arts. These measures relate to language development, listening, literature, reading, standard English as a second language or dialect, teacher competencies, or writing. In order to make these instruments more readily available, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills has supported the TRIP committee sponsored by the Committee on Research of the National Council of Teachers of English and has processed the material into the ERIC system. The ERIC Clearinghouse accession numbers that encompass most of these documents are CS 201320-CS 201375.

TRIP Committee:

W.T. Fagan, Chairman
University of Alberta, Edmonton

Charles R. Cooper
State University of New York
at Buffalo

Julie M. Jensen
The University of Texas at Austin

Bernard O'Donnell
Director, ERIC/RCS

Roy C. O'Donnell
The University of Georgia
Liaison to NCTE Committee
on Research

CS 201 374

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
1111 KENYON ROAD
URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801

Category: Teacher Competency

Title: The "Place of Drama" Questionnaire

Authors: James Hoetker and Richard Robb

Description of the Instrument:

Purpose: To assess teachers' attitudes toward a variety of objectives for teaching drama.

Date of Construction: 1967

Physical Description: Requiring about twenty minutes to complete, the PDQ is a thirty-two item, Likert-type questionnaire. A principal component factor analysis of results from a large-scale tryout yielded the following factors or categories among the items: noncognitive personal development, ethical growth, literary knowledge, improvement of taste and behavior, curricular utility, theatre-specific knowledge, transfer of skills, enjoyment, art appreciation.

Validity, Reliability, and Normative Data:

The validity of the PDQ rests primarily on the fact that the items in the questionnaire were carefully chosen from among hundreds of objectives for the teaching of drama in English methods textbooks, publications of professional organizations, curriculum guides, journal articles, books on drama and theatre, and other writings about the dramatic experience. Eight a priori categories were devised to cover the range of objectives for drama, and then English teachers and other educators sorted the objectives into the categories with rather high agreement (85% in one sorting). Items over which there was disagreement were revised or discarded. Then a random sample of four items was taken from each of the eight categories to make up

the final thirty-two item questionnaire. The factor analysis mentioned above confirmed the usefulness and appropriateness of the categories.

No reliability data are mentioned in the report where PDQ appears, but there is normative data from the four groups in the study: English teachers, actors, administrators, and drama teachers.

Ordering information:

EDRS

Related documents:

Also available in James Hoetker and Richard Robb, "Drama in the Secondary School: A Study of Objectives, "Research in the Teaching of English, 3 (Fall 1969), 127-159

RESEARCH IN THE
TEACHING OF ENGLISH

VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2, FALL 1969

Contents

ARTICLES

127 Drama in the secondary school: A study of objectives
by James Hoetker and Richard Robb

160 Understanding allusions in literature
by Marjorie Roberts

166 The effects of prereading assistance on the comprehension and attitudes of good and poor readers
by Richard J. Smith and Karl D. Hesse

178 ITA and TO training in the development of children's creative writing
by Joanne A. Auguste and Fredric B. Nalven

181 Measuring teacher judgment in the evaluation of written composition
by Vernon H. Smith

196 Teaching punctuation in the ninth grade by means of intonation cues
by Jeanette R. Held

209 An experimental comparison of writing achievement in English composition and humanities classes
by William C. Budd

Hoetker, James
Robb, Richard
"The 'Place of Drama' Questionnaire"
1967

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

National Council of Teachers of English

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Messrs. Hoetker and Robb have identified some basic differences in the objectives held by actors and by secondary school English teachers, drama teachers, and administrators for the study of drama. The analysis is illuminating not only for curriculum-planners and test-makers but more specifically, as the investigators put it, for "those current reformers who would like to see English teachers give a more central place in the English curriculum to dramatic activity." Although the study focuses on drama, it indirectly suggests some insights into attitudes toward the functioning of literature in general in the English curriculum. Perhaps someone will do a similar analysis of the objectives for writing and literary study held by elementary school teachers, high school English teachers, writers, parents, students, and school administrators.

Drama in the secondary school: a study of objectives

JAMES HOETKER
and RICHARD ROBB
Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, St. Louis

The study reported here is one in a series undertaken in connection with CEMREL'S assessment of the Educational Laboratory Theatre Project, a federally supported three-year program which, beginning in 1966, has introduced professional theatre to secondary school students in New Orleans, Los Angeles, and Rhode Island. In each of these sites a professional resident company presents three or four "classic" plays a year for student audiences and also provides a number of related educational services such as school visits and drama workshops for students and teachers.

From the beginning of the project, it was clear that almost everyone assumed that the English teachers would bear an important part of the responsibility for maximizing student

benefits from the project and that the treatment given the plays in the classroom would be a crucial element in the overall success of the project. Funds were provided, for example, to prepare and distribute special curriculum materials for each play to all English teachers and to hold various workshops and inservice training activities.

The English teachers were given this responsibility, unasked, for two reasons: first, Shakespeare, Shaw, Sophocles, and other classic dramatists were already part of the English curriculum; and, second, English is the only course required of almost all students in all grades, and it was therefore administratively convenient, as well as apparently logical, to give the English teachers the job of relating the theatre to the curriculum.

With responsibility, however, goes the expectation of a voice in making decisions; and it soon became clear that the English teachers and the theatre people, not to mention the other interested groups, held firm but often incompatible ideas about how students should be prepared for theatre attendance and about what plays were most suitable for production as part of the project. It seemed reasonable to assume that these differences stemmed from the fact that the groups held divergent conceptions of drama and consequently also held different objectives for the teaching of drama.

These differences were important for at least two reasons. First, they affected the operation of the project itself—in the area of play selection, for example, where each group desired the production of plays that they thought would contribute to the attainment of the objectives they valued most highly. Second, the differences seemed to be characteristic of the professional groups involved, and not of a few individuals, so that similar differences could be expected to affect the operation of any school-theatre enterprise.

The present study was therefore undertaken: (1) to describe quantitatively the differences among the objectives held by the various groups; (2) to enable us to investigate, by readministering the instrument developed for the study, whether the objectives of the groups became more congruent as a result of participation in the program; (3) to provide us with categories of objectives that would guide us in constructing tests to be used in a planned experimental study which would test the hypotheses of the various groups about the most ef-

fective ways to teach drama; (4) to provide us with information about the relative values placed by the groups on different categories of objectives, so that when the experimental study was completed it would be possible to report results in the following form: "Treatment X produces the highest scores on the objectives most highly valued by actors, but Method Y produces the highest scores in the categories most valued by English teachers."

The readministration of the instrument is scheduled for the end of the project; and the study has already served the purpose of structuring an experiment with methods of teaching drama, which began in September, 1968, in twenty Rhode Island high schools. The rest of this paper deals with the results of the descriptive study itself.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

Several hundred statements of objectives for the teaching of drama were collected from English methods textbooks, publications of professional organizations, curriculum guides, journal articles, books on drama and theatre, and the writings of others who have concerned themselves with the dramatic experience: psychologists, educators, actors, philosophers, critics, and so forth. The statements so collected were edited to fit the blank in one of the following sentences:

> "An important reason for including the drama in the high school English curriculum is to . . . . . ."
>
> "An important reason for including the drama in the high school English curriculum is that . . . . . ."

A preliminary system of categorization of the statements was developed, and a number of English teachers and other educators were asked to sort a sample of the statements into these categories. On the basis of this first sorting, the categories were redefined and the items re-edited to make them as brief and straightforward as possible.

The sorting process was repeated again with a group of student teachers of English in a methods course. These sorters agreed more than 85% of the time in their assignment of specific items to categories. The items which caused disagreement or confusion were examined and discussed with the teachers. In most cases, the disagreements could be clearly traced to an ambiguity in the item or to a weakness in the category definition. The category definitions were revised where necessary and the troublesome items rewritten or discarded.

A total of eight *a priori* categories were decided on by the process. These were grouped into three general divisions and several subdivisions.

Intrinsic Value

1. Intrinsic value. Items referring to the dramatic experience as a thing in itself, valuable without reference to a utilitarian end or value.

Academic Value

Cognitive

2. Dramatic and literary knowledge. Items referring to the mastery of the content of the lessons connected with the plays.

3. Literary skills. Items referring to the development and transfer of the skills of analyzing and interpreting plays and other forms of literature.

Affective

4. Appreciation and taste. Items referring to the development of appreciation and good taste, not only in drama, but in other forms of literature, the arts, and the mass media.

Ethical

5. Ethical growth. Items referring to the longer-range development of philosophical insights, moral understandings, and ethical behaviors—the sorts of outcomes claimed for the humanistic disciplines in general.

Utilitarian Value

6. Personal and social benefits. Items referring to the benefits, for the individual and the group, of participation in dramatic activities (apart from the benefits falling in the academic categories above)—e.g., self-confidence, teamwork.

7. Benefits to the theatre and the arts. Items referring to the development of specific attitudes and patterns of behavior considered desirable by those involved in theatre and in the arts.

8. Curricular usefulness. Items referring to the drama considered as a vehicle for introducing content into the curriculum (e.g., linguistic study), or for achieving objectives unrelated to those included in the foregoing categories.

When these categories had been decided on, five members of the research staff sat down together and went through the pool of items, assigning them one by one to the categories. In the course of this process, further minor revisions were made both in items and in category definitions. No item was assigned to a category unless everyone agreed that it clearly belonged in that particular category.

To construct the questionnaire itself, a table of random

numbers was used to select four items from each of the eight categories. The 32 items thus chosen were then randomly assigned positions on the questionnaire. A copy of the completed questionnaire is appended to this report and the reader may wish to examine it at this point. The respondents, as will be seen, were asked to rate each item on a 7-point scale running from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." On the cover sheet of the questionnaire, each of the points on the scale is verbally defined.

The 32 statements which appear on the questionnaire are listed below, under the category heading to which they were originally assigned. The number of each item is the number by which it was identified on the questionnaire. Following each statement, in parentheses, is the key word or phrase by which the statement is sometimes referred to hereafter, for the sake of brevity.

Category 1. *Intrinsic value*

5. to engage students in fulfilling and creative activities. (Fulfillment)
6. simply that students enjoy dramatic activities. (Simply enjoy)
10. to bring life and movement into the classroom. (Life in classroom)
14. that play acting is itself an aesthetic experience that no young person should miss. (Aesthetic experience)

Category 2. *Dramatic and literary knowledge*

17. to give students a thorough understanding of the history and development of the theatre. (History of theatre)
18. to give students a mastery of the critical vocabulary necessary to an intelligent discussion of dramatic literature. (Vocabulary)
20. to familiarize students with the different types of drama—tragedy, comedy, farce, melodrama, and so on. (Types of drama)
22. to acquaint the students with the technical aspects of theatrical production. (Technical knowledge)

Category 3. *Literary skills*

12. that study of the drama can develop the students' abilities to deal critically with other forms of literature. (Critical skill)
15. to develop in students the ability to read a play in the way an actor or director reads it. (Read as actor does)
16. to teach students how to interpret symbolism as used in certain types of plays. (Symbolism)
23. to help students to learn how to become more perceptive members of the audience at a play. (Perceptive audience)

Category 4. *Appreciation and taste*

11. to help students to grow increasingly sophisticated in their selection of plays to watch and read. (Taste in plays)
21. to improve the students' taste in entertainment. (Taste in entertainment)
24. to give students experiences that will enable them to appreciate other great works of art. (Appreciate art)
25. to develop in students a distaste for the cheap and shoddy and sensational in art and literature. (Distaste for bad)

Category 5. *Ethical growth*

29. that drama provides moral lessons from which students can learn how to better order their own lives. (Moral lessons)
30. to give students a deeper understanding of their own motives and of human nature in general. (Understand self)
31. to help students develop a philosophy of life through contact with the "best thoughts of the best minds." (Philosophy of life)
32. that, by perceiving the world through the senses of persons unlike themselves, students will develop tolerance and a deeper understanding of the human condition. (Tolerance)

Category 6. *Personal and social benefits*

2. to develop in students the capacity for moving gracefully, easily, and expressively. (Move gracefully)
3. that dramatic activities can help a student develop self-confidence. (Self-confidence)
4. to develop in students the habits of cooperation and teamwork. (Cooperation)
13. to extend the range, fluency, and effectiveness of student speech. (Fluent speech)

Category 7. *Benefits to the theatre and the arts*

1. to encourage students to take part in community dramatic activities. (Community dramatics)
7. to stimulate interest in the theatre so that students will become regular patrons of the professional theatre when they are adults. (Theatregoers)
8. to teach students how a mature theatregoer should behave at a play. (Behave at play)
9. to locate student talent for school dramatic activities. (Locate talent)

Category 8. *Curricular usefulness*

19. that great dramas provide many excellent topics for composition assignments. (Composition)
26. that such study can help students to understand European and American history more thoroughly. (Teach history)
27. that dramatic activities such as improvisation are excellent

preparation for creative writing assignments. (Creative writing)
28. that drama, and especially Shakespeare, provides a wealth of examples for study of language and linguistic change. (Linguistics)

THE SAMPLES

Although our major concern was with the objectives for drama held by English teachers and members of the resident theatre companies, the questionnaire was also administered to groups of drama teachers and school administrators in the three areas. Although we were, of course, interested in what students involved in the program thought of the place of drama in the schools, it was decided to restrict the study at first to adults who might reasonably be presumed to have more or less clearly structured ideas about the teaching of drama. We feared that the inclusion of a sample of students, many of whom would probably not have opinions on the subject, and who might tend to respond randomly or according to some unpredictable set, would greatly reduce our chances of finding conceptually meaningful factors.

The sample of English teachers (N=116) was chosen by a two-step process. First, information gathered earlier on the schools (enrollment; socioeconomic status; public, private, or religious management; coeducational or sexually segregated student body) was used to construct a stratified sample of participating schools in each area. Then, from the schools in this sample, English teachers were chosen at random in a number proportionate to the student enrollment.

In each of the schools in the sample, the questionnaire was also given to the drama teacher, if there was one, and to either the principal or assistant principal, if one of them was available. The sample of school administrators (N=26) may be taken as representative of the population of administrators in the areas. But the sample of drama teachers (N=21) is more problematical. Drama is a marginal activity in most school systems, and all of the teachers identified as drama teachers also taught English or some other subject. Furthermore, the presence or absence of a drama teacher in a particular school depended on the geographical area and, within an area, was related to the socioeconomic level of the school. Therefore, although the results for drama teachers are included in the present report, they should be very cautiously interpreted.

The sample of resident company members, hereafter called

"actors," (N=48) is an almost complete sample[1] of the members of the casts of the plays that were in production at the time the instrument was administered. In regard to the theatre project cities, the actors may well be looked on as the population of actors, rather than as a sample. How representative they may be of the population of actors nationwide is probably impossible to establish. Aside from the fact that none of them was an established star, however, there is no apparent reason for thinking the actors unrepresentative of, say, the population of Equity members currently working as performers.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

In every case, the questionnaire was taken to a school or theatre by an interviewer who presented the respondent with a brief printed explanation of the study, waited while the questionnaire was completed, and then carried away the completed questionnaire. This procedure made the administration of the questionnaire a rather lengthy and expensive process, but it obtained responses from everyone in the primary English teacher sample and, certainly, from more members of the other groups than would have responded otherwise.

The questionnaires were thus administered to about one-half of the total sample during the spring of 1968. The analyses of this partial data provided guidance for the construction of the tests for the experimental study of teaching methods that was mentioned earlier. The questionnaire was administered to the remainder of the sample immediately after the opening of school in the fall of 1968.

EXPECTATIONS

We undertook this study with some preconceptions about what we might find, based on our previous experiences with the theatre project. The English teachers, we thought, would rate most highly those objectives having to do with subject matter learning and with the high-level "ethical objectives." They would also, it seemed likely, place little value on nonverbal outcomes and on those related to the welfare of the theatre. The school administrators, we would have predicted, would give the highest ratings to those objectives having to do with social learning. We expected the actors to value most highly the objectives concerned with affective change, per-

[1] No actor refused to complete the questionnaire; it was simply impossible for our interviewers to get together with one or two members of each of the companies.

sonal development, and benefit to the theatre. The drama teachers we were less sure of, but thought they might fall somewhere between the actors and English teachers. Some of these expectations were confirmed, as we shall see, but there were also surprises.

MEAN RATINGS OF ITEMS

Since the statements included as items on the questionnaire were all obtained from reputable printed sources, it was not to be expected that many of them would appear so trivial or wrongheaded as to be rejected by any large number of respondents. This indeed proved to be the case, and the mean ratings given to most of the items were well toward the positive or "agree" end of the scale, on which "strongly disagree" equals one point and "strongly agree" seven points. The mean rating of all respondents on all items was 5.31, and the mean rating of only one item fell below 4.00. As shown in Table 1, in which the means are rank-ordered, item means ranged from 3.57 up to 6.33, with a standard deviation of 0.73.

Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations
of the Ratings of All Respondents (N=211),
with Item Ratings Rank-ordered

Item No.	Mean	S.D.	Item No.	Mean	S.D.
9	3.57	1.73	7	5.35	1.67
1	4.13	1.73	4	5.38	1.45
15	4.18	1.73	6	5.45	1.39
2	4.21	1.93	16	5.46	1.31
22	4.45	1.54	3	5.56	1.39
8	4.65	1.90	31	5.73	1.42
26	4.73	1.60	13	5.75	1.08
19	4.92	1.78	11	5.84	1.29
27	4.93	1.52	5	5.90	1.14
17	5.04	1.51	20	6.04	1.09
10	5.17	1.58	21	6.08	1.15
18	5.19	1.45	23	6.14	1.04
25	5.19	1.74	24	6.14	0.98
29	5.20	1.56	30	6.19	1.18
14	5.24	1.49	32	6.31	1.02
28	5.35	1.42	12	6.33	0.98

Grand Mean = 5.31 Range = 2.76 Points

S.D. = 0.76 Points

Table 2
Group Mean Scores on All
Questionnaire Items, with F-Ratios, and Significance
Levels of Differences among Means

Item Number and Key Words	Mean Scores English 1	Drama 2	Actor 3	Administrator 4	$F_{.207}$ 5	P< 6	Item Number
1. Community dramatics	3.92	4.29	4.42	4.58	1.313	0.271	1
2. Move gracefully	3.86	4.71	4.50	5.15	4.023	0.008*	2
3. Self-confidence	5.31	6.29	5.67	6.12	5.658	0.001*	3
4. Cooperation	5.18	6.10	5.58	5.54	3.845	0.010*	4
5. Fulfillment	5.73	6.29	6.17	6.04	2.765	0.043*	5
6. Simply enjoy	5.57	5.24	5.31	5.27	1.330	0.266	6
7. Theatregoers	5.28	5.71	5.69	4.92	1.290	0.279	7
8. Behave at play	4.57	5.43	4.23	5.23	2.704	0.046*	8
9. Locate talent	3.39	4.33	3.52	4.04	2.266	0.082	9
10. Life in classroom	5.23	4.76	5.15	5.19	0.774	0.510	10
11. Taste in plays	5.94	6.09	5.47	5.77	1.716	0.165	11
12. Critical skills	6.36	6.48	6.14	6.39	0.816	0.487	12
13. Fluent speech	5.59	6.00	6.04	5.93	3.118	0.027*	13

14.	Aesthetic experience	5.25	5.76	4.92	5.42	1.890	0.132	14
15.	Read as actor does	4.25	4.19	3.79	4.54	1.187	0.316	15
16.	Symbolism	5.68	5.71	4.81	5.27	4.092	0.008*	16
17.	History of theatre	5.02	5.29	4.92	5.15	0.603	0.614	17
18.	Vocabulary	5.27	5.29	4.83	5.27	0.943	0.421	18
19.	Composition	5.04	5.10	4.50	4.85	0.789	0.501	19
20.	Types of drama	6.15	6.29	5.60	6.04	2.964	0.033*	20
21.	Taste in entertainment	6.08	6.33	5.92	6.12	2.120	0.099	21
22.	Technical knowledge	4.45	5.19	4.16	4.42	2.699	0.047*	22
23.	Perceptive audience	6.18	6.48	5.79	6.23	3.063	0.029*	23
24.	Appreciate art	6.17	6.33	6.04	6.00	0.924	0.430	24
25.	Distaste for bad	5.43	5.29	4.23	5.54	7.400	0.001*	25
26.	Teach history	4.48	4.86	5.21	5.12	3.725	0.012*	26
27.	Creative writing	4.94	4.81	4.98	4.89	0.081	0.970	27
28.	Linguistics	5.09	5.52	5.85	5.65	8.067	0.001*	28
29.	Moral lessons	5.41	5.38	4.71	4.85	1.889	0.133	29
30.	Understand self	6.46	5.86	5.77	5.69	6.857	0.001*	30
31.	Philosophy of life	5.97	5.67	5.17	5.46	4.197	0.007*	31
32.	Tolerance	6.50	6.10	5.96	6.08	3.231	0.023*	32
	Mean	5.31	5.54	5.17	5.40			

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION ANALYSIS

The first question at issue in this study was whether the four groups of respondents could be discriminated by means of their ratings of items on a questionnaire designed to describe the structure of the objectives held for the teaching of drama. A linear multiple discriminant function analysis of the item scores of all respondents on all items was carried out.[2] Four patterns of responses to the 32 items were statistically derived, and each respondent was assigned to one of these patterns on the basis of his responses. If it had been the case that the responses of all English teachers and of no one else had fallen into Pattern 1, and that the other three groups had been similarly perfectly discriminated, the analysis would have yielded the following matrix:

	Statistically Derived Groups			
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*
English teachers	116	0	0	0
Drama teachers	0	21	0	0
Actors	0	0	48	0
Administrators	0	0	0	26

In fact, the analysis yielded the matrix which is given below in two forms: first, the number of respondents from each group assigned to each response pattern, then the percentage of the respondents from each group assigned to each pattern.

	Statistically Derived Groups				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*N*
English teachers	76	13	10	17	116
Drama teachers	0	13	3	5	21
Actors	5	6	31	6	48
Administrators	5	2	2	17	26

	Statistically Derived Groups				
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*%*
English teachers	65.5	11.2	8.6	14.7	100.0
Drama teachers	0.0	61.9	14.3	23.8	100.0
Actors	10.4	12.5	64.6	12.5	100.0
Administrators	19.2	7.7	7.7	65.4	100.0

[2] See T. W. Anderson, *Introduction to multivariate statistical analysis* (New York: John Wiley, 1958), Sections 6.7 and following.

The generalized Mahalanobis D-square yielded by the analysis was 238.06; this statistic may be used as a chi-square with, in this case, 96 degrees of freedom. The probability of the distribution in the above matrices occurring by chance is less than one in 1000, so the four groups indeed may be discriminated by means of their responses to the questionnaire used in this study.

Columns 1 to 4 in Table 2 summarize the group mean ratings on each of the 32 items and give the group means over all items. Although the absolute ratings given to an item differ among groups, sometimes considerably, there is a tendency for all groups to give similar ratings to an item relative to the other items. (See Table 5, below.)

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE[3]

Column 5 in Table 2 gives the F-ratios derived from an analysis of variance of the differences among the ratings given to each item by the four groups. Column 6 in the same table gives the level of significance of each F-ratio, and an asterisk marks those values beyond the .05 level of significance, a total of 16 cases.

---

[3] In presenting the results of the one-way analysis of variance, in which group responses have been pooled across locations, we are, in effect, disclaiming a desire to generalize beyond the group populations in the areas affected by the Educational Laboratory Theatre Project. We have chosen to do this because the data do not allow us to perform a straightforward analysis of variance by groups across locations, a procedure which would have allowed us to partition location effects, given us a more conservative estimate of between-group differences, and allowed us to suggest that the contrasts that were found were indeed typical of the groups involved. But, as it happened, the schools in one of the areas simply do not have drama teachers, giving us one empty cell; and the element of chance determining whether an administrator completed the questionnaire gave us a very unequal distribution of administrators among locations, with the smallest number unfortunately occurring in the same location in which there were no drama teachers.

We were able to do a two-way analysis between English teachers and actors across the three locations. And we performed a two-way analysis of variance for all four groups across locations after estimating the missing data according to the method described in B. J. Winer, *Statistical principles in experimental design* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), pp. 281-283. The results of these analyses (which will be reported in full in CEMREL's final report on the Educational Laboratory Theatre Project) lead us to the opinion that the between-location effects are unimportant enough that the one-way between-groups analysis is legitimate, and, further, that the liberal estimate of between-group difference given by this procedure is desirable in the present case for heuristic purposes.

Table 3
Rotated Factor Loading of
Nine Factors with Eigen Values Greater than 1.0

Item No.	Factor No. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	.338	−.073	−.032	−.341	−.329	−.403	.209	.254	−.087
2	.696	−.038	.023	−.138	−.324	−.222	.013	.079	−.157
3	.781	.047	−.066	−.039	−.190	−.042	.069	.033	−.111
4	.778	−.065	−.083	−.220	−.079	.083	−.091	−.021	.192
5	.748	.226	−.003	.039	.154	−.160	.004	.128	.198
6	.163	.096	.032	−.111	.079	−.134	−.046	.758	.055
7	.175	.095	−.025	−.705	.044	−.188	−.180	.121	−.088
8	.184	.082	−.075	−.612	−.217	−.266	−.227	.118	−.195
9	.497	−.140	−.028	−.300	−.232	−.382	−.018	.112	−.035
10	.354	.058	−.157	−.131	−.219	.061	−.497	.409	−.083
11	.121	.198	−.399	−.505	.148	.050	−.418	.069	.104
12	.050	.157	−.369	−.065	−.198	−.015	−.588	.095	.265
13	.680	.138	−.072	.021	−.143	−.064	−.336	−.041	−.011
14	.356	.157	−.201	−.002	−.403	−.056	−.133	.301	.035
15	.163	.112	−.355	−.135	−.095	−.[illegible]6	−.[illegible]97	.055	−.139
16	.035	.083	−.781	−.024	−.109	−.053	−.130	.120	.096
17	.101	.036	−.547	−.049	−.112	−.617	−.107	−.140	.084
18	.166	.207	−.714	−.082	.126	−.371	−.130	−.192	.033
19	.130	.209	−.600	−.201	−.461	−.011	.074	−.145	−.100
20	−.149	.003	−.581	−.099	−.391	−.263	−.046	.045	.252
21	.043	.167	−.077	−.690	−.117	.016	−.014	−.074	.281
22	.080	.107	−.125	−.108	−.133	−.731	−.005	.098	.130
23	.004	.198	−.061	−.232	.036	−.371	−.607	−.104	.174
24	.072	.183	−.178	−.127	−.140	−.096	−.212	.032	.699
25	−.098	.288	−.129	−.546	−.116	−.078	.333	.006	.303
26	.184	.135	−.036	−.056	−.595	−.360	−.233	−.108	.075
27	.241	.115	−.167	−.082	−.704	−.036	.023	−.049	.117
28	.271	−.011	−.111	−.057	−.475	−.229	−.073	−.487	.039
29	.064	.760	−.091	−.220	−.210	−.009	−.041	−.022	−.200
30	.031	.839	−.065	−.037	.001	−.082	−.112	.028	.123
31	−.001	.760	−.240	−.218	−.059	−.043	−.002	−.033	.033
32	.119	.747	.001	.008	−.041	−.079	−.152	.127	.304
% of variance	11.7	9.3	8.8	7.8	7.1	7.0	5.5	4.3	3.9

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS FACTOR ANALYSIS

The ratings of all respondents to all items were subjected to a principal components factor analysis, using a varimax rotation. The rotated factor loadings for the nine factors with eigen values greater than 1.0 are given in Table 3. These nine factors together account for 65.33% of the total variance.

It was arbitrarily decided to include in any factor only those items which loaded .500 or higher on the factor. The items in each factor meeting that criterion are listed below, by item number and key word. Each of the factors makes conceptual sense and was easily assigned a title.[4] Taken together, they reasonably approximate the *a priori* categories devised during the construction of the questionnaire.

Factor 1. *Noncognitive personal development*
- 2. Move gracefully
- 3. Self-confidence
- 4. Cooperation
- 5. Creative activities
- 13. Fluent speech

Factor 2. *Ethical growth*
- 29. Moral lessons
- 30. Understand self
- 31. Philosophy of life
- 32. Tolerance

---

4 Each of the factors now makes good sense. But, in some cases, the inclusion of items that are heavily loaded on a factor, but below the .500 cut-off point, would create difficulties of interpretation. A good instance is item 9 ("Locate talent"), which loads +.497 on Factor 1, which is otherwise composed of items having to do with "Noncognitive personal development." Similarly, the inclusion of item 28 ("Linguistics"), which loads +.475 on Factor 5 and −.487 on Factor 8, would complicate interpretation of those factors. On the other hand, there are instances in which the inclusion of a marginally loaded item would tend to strengthen our interpretation of a factor. A case in point is item 15 ("Read as an actor does"), which loads −.476 on Factor 6 and would, if included, buttress the conclusion that this factor has to do with the attainment of specifically theatrical skills.

The decision to use the .500 loading as a criterion for including an item in a factor was made during the analysis of the data from the first half of the sample in June, 1968. As it turns out, the decision was a happy one, and we will stick by it while acknowledging that a somewhat different set of factors would have emerged if the criterion had been, say, .400. Additional analyses of these data are being carried out, by the way, preparatory to relating this study to the results of the experiment with methods of teaching drama. The additional analyses will include an image factor analysis to confirm the "reality" of the factors that emerged from the principal components factor analysis.

Table 4
Comparison of Items Assigned to Eight *A Priori* Categories and Items Loading .500 or Higher on Nine Factors

Category	Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	5	.748								
	6								.758	
	10									
	14									
2	17			−.547			−.617			
	18			−.714						
	20			−.581						
	22						−.731			
3	12							−.588		
	15									
	16			−.781						
	23							−.607		
4	11				−.505					
	21				−.690					
	24									.699
	25				−.546					
5	29		.760							
	30		.839							
	31		.760							
	32		.747							
6	2	.696								
	3	.781								
	4	.778								
	13	.680								
7	1									
	7				−.705					
	8				−.612					
	9									
8	19			−.600						
	26					−.595				
	27					−.704				
	28									

Factor 3. *Literary knowledge*
- 16. Symbolism
- 17. History of theatre
- 18. Vocabulary
- 19. Composition
- 20. Types of drama

Factor 4. *Improvement of taste and behavior*
- 7. Theatregoers
- 8. Behave at play
- 11. Taste in plays
- 21. Taste in entertainment
- 25. Distaste for bad

Factor 5. *Curricular utility*
- 26. Teach history
- 27. Creative writing

Factor 6. *Theatre-specific knowledge*
- 17. History of theatre
- 22. Technical knowledge

Factor 7. *Transfer of skills*
- 12. Critical skill
- 23. Perceptive audience

Factor 8. *Enjoyment*
- 6. Simply enjoy

Factor 9. *Art appreciation*
- 24. Appreciate art

Table 4 compares the *a priori* categories with the factors. Factor 1, "Noncognitive personal development," includes all four items from *a priori* category 6, "Personal and social benefits," and one item (5, "Fulfillment") which had originally been construed as belonging in the "Intrinsic value" category. Factor 2 corresponds exactly to *a priori* category 5, "Ethical growth." Factor 3, "Literary knowledge," includes three of the original four items from category 2, "Dramatic and literary knowledge," and also includes item 16 ("Symbolism") and item 19 ("Composition"), which had been placed in categories 3, "Literary skills," and 8, "Curricular utility," respectively. Our respondents apparently distinguished matters specific to the literature class from those more common to the drama class. Two of the items of the latter sort from category 2—item 17 ("History of drama") and 22 ("Technical knowledge")—together form a separate factor, 6.

Factor 4, "Improvement of taste and behavior," includes items from *a priori* categories 4 and 7—"Appreciation and

taste" and "Benefits to the theatre and the arts." These items appear to have in common the elements of *improvement* of taste and behavior. The two items from category 7 which do not load on any factor—item 1 ("Community dramatics") and 9 ("Locate talent") are certainly the most trivial of the objectives and were so rated by the respondents. Our reason for having grouped these items with item 7 ("Theatregoers") and 8 ("Behave at play") in category 7 had, in part, to do with the element of *practicality* common to the items, as well as to their all being related to the theatre. But it seems upon reexamination that our grouping was expedient rather than discerning, and that the grouping represented in Factor 4 makes sounder sense.

It is interesting that the fourth item from the "Appreciation and taste" category—item 24 ("Appreciate art")—falls out as the single-item Factor 9. Probably the term "art appreciation" has denotations and connotations that are so firmly established that the respondents inevitably would rate the item independently of their ratings of the more narrowly dramatic or literary appreciation items with which it had been associated in the construction of the questionnaire.

Item 6 ("Simply enjoy") also constitutes a single-item factor, 8. This was really no surprise; though we had often found expressed the idea that drama should be done simply because it is good, we had found it extremely difficult to collect a nonredundant pool of items for the *a priori* category 1, which we labeled "Intrinsic value." It is probably the case that all the items which really belong in this category are merely verbal variations on "because it is good."

DIFFERENCES AMONG GROUPS ON ITEMS WITHIN FACTORS

Let us first dispose of the five weaker factors, 5 through 9. The groups did not differ significantly in their ratings of either of the single item factors, 8 and 9. Each group gave item 6 (Factor 8) a moderate rating and item 24 (Factor 9) a quite high one. Each of the two item factors contains one item which discriminated among groups and one which did not. In Factor 5, item 26 ("Teach history") was rated rather high by actors and administrators, lower by drama and English teachers ($F_{3,207}=3.73$; $P<.05$). It is expected that English and drama teachers would not be overconcerned with teaching history; but it had been called to our attention earlier that while most teachers think history should be taught so students

can understand plays, most actors think plays are a good way to teach history.

In Factor 6, "Theatre-specific knowledge," item 22 ("Technical knowledge") was rated quite low by everyone except the drama teachers, who gave it a moderate rating ($F_{3,207}=2.70$; $P<.05$).

In Factor 7, "Transfer of skills," item 23 ("Perceptive audience") was rated very highly by everyone except, a bit surprisingly, the actors, who gave it a moderately high rating ($F_{3,207}=3.06$; $P<.05$). Very likely, the actors perceived that

Figure 1
Comparison of Group Means, in Standard Score Form, on Items in Factor 1, "Noncognitive Personal Development"



the job of educating an audience is one that can only be done, ultimately, in the theatre itself.

Figures 1 through 4 graphically illustrate the variations among the four groups in their ratings of the items in the four strongest factors. In each of these figures, the items are arranged in order of the mean ratings given them by the English teachers. Means have been converted into standard scores to compensate for the differences in overall means among groups. The significance level of the differences among the groups is given beneath the number of each item.

The items in Factor 1, "Noncognitive personal development," refer to outcomes that are attainable only if the stu-

Figure 2
Comparison of Group Means, in Standard Score Form, on Items in Factor 2, "Ethical Growth"



dent participates in dramatic activities—gracefulness, self-confidence, more fluent speech, cooperation. Obviously, these objectives would be less than important to one who conceived of drama primarily as a literary genre rather than as a physical and oral activity, for he would see the educational function in regard to drama as studying it rather than *doing* it. Figure 1 suggests that, to a much greater extent than the other groups, the English teachers so regard drama.

The differences among the groups on all five items are significant, and in all cases the English teachers give the items the lowest ratings. The differences among the other three groups in their ratings are nonsignificant. One inference that may be made is that the English teachers do not see dramatic activity as of primary importance to the study of drama. (This attitude, if typical, is probably a reflection of the teacher's self-definition of his role as English teacher, and it will certainly provide an obstacle to those current reformers who would like to see English teachers give a more central place in the English curriculum to dramatic activity.)

Figure 2 compares the groups in their ratings of the items in Factor 2, "Ethical growth." The differences among the groups are significant on the three most highly rated items, with the English teachers in each case rating the objectives more highly than the other groups and being alone in rating the fourth item—29 "Moral lessons"—above the mean rating of all items. All differences among actors, drama teachers, and administrators are nonsignificant.

Item 29 specifies a *way* of using drama toward ethical ends ("drama provides moral lessons . . .") which the respondents may have perceived as embodying a naive or simplistic attitude toward drama and which possibly modified their approval of the latter part of the objective ("from which students can learn how to better order their own lives").

The objectives in this factor—tolerance, self-understanding, development of a philosophy of life, ordering one's own life—are, of course, prominent in arguments in favor of a liberal education, particularly one built around the literary classics. These objectives, also, unlike those in the other categories, have no special relationship to drama, except insofar as drama is a branch of literature.[5]

[5] It should also be noted that these "ethical growth" objectives are

Obviously, one who believes that drama is in the curriculum in the service of objectives such as these is bound to prefer a different sort of play—of primarily literary and philosophical merit, one that is "teachable"—than a person whose preference for a play is based on theatrical considerations. Further, the person who most highly values these ethical objectives may feel little need to include theatre and dramatic activities, as distinct from dramatic literature, among the experiences his students must have in order to reap the benefits of a liberal education.

The disparities revealed here between the values placed upon personal-social and ethical objectives by actors and English teachers may do a good deal to aid in an understanding of the difficulties in communication between the theatre personnel and the English teaching community that have bothered most school-theatre enterprises.

Only two of the five items in Factor 3, "Literary knowledge," differentiate among the groups. The actors rate item 20 ("Types of drama") considerably lower than the other groups, perhaps in fear of the results of overemphasis upon the scholarly trappings of drama, rather than upon the play itself. The actors again, this time joined by the administrators, also place a lower value than the teachers upon item 16, which refers

---

"internal" and long-range, so that in the vast majority of cases it will be impossible for the teacher ever to know that his efforts have contributed to the attainment of the objectives in question. This means that the teacher who says he is teaching primarily to attain ethical objectives is in the positions of (1) operating according to a blind faith which can be neither supported nor threatened by empirical evidence and (2) being quite unable to demonstrate to a skeptic any necessary connection between either his subject matter or his methods and the effects he purports to be having on his students. One in this position is likely, first, to deny that proof of the ethical efficacy of great literature is necessary, and, second, to have little patience with anyone so perverse as to ask for such proof.

What we would suggest, at least tentatively and without singling out the English teachers for criticism (for there is ample opportunity for self-deception in regard to the attainment of most of the goals valued by the other groups), is that value differences in regard to objectives that are matters of faith and dogma are likely to be extremely disruptive of communication, since such matters of belief are deeply involved with one's perception of himself and highly loaded with affect. The practical consequences of such differences, that is to say, may be greater than the statistical differences suggest.

Figure 3
Comparison of Group Means, in
Standard Score Form, on Items in Factor 3, "Literary
Knowledge"



to students "learning how to interpret symbolism." The dichotomy here is not between the theatre and the schools, but between those who are keepers of the specialized skill of literary interpretation and those who are not.

Two of the five items in Factor 4, "Improvement of taste and behavior," also discriminate among the groups, and in both cases it is the actors who diverge from the three groups of school people. While the groups differed in the absolute

value they placed upon the items, on each of the three factors just considered there was a tendency for the groups to agree on the relative importance of the items in a factor. In the present case, however, the actors' ratings diverge from this pattern.

Item 25, which three groups gave a moderate rating, reads, "to develop in students a distaste for the cheap and shoddy and sensational in art and literature." This item was rated by the actors above only items 9 ("Locate talent") and 22

Figure 4
Comparison of Group Means, in Standard Score Form, on Items in Factor 4, "Improvement of Taste and Behavior"



("Technical knowledge") among the 32 items. Whether this discrepancy—the actors rated the item at least a full point lower than any of the other groups—is attributable to their rejection of drama being used for negative purposes, to their distrust of the effects upon students' reception of theatre or the conception of art implied in the statement, or to something else, cannot be established from the data; but the divergence is thought-provoking.

The actors differed most from the administrators in rating item 7 ("Theatregoers"), although the difference is nonsignificant, with the actors understandably placing more value on the objective of getting students to become patrons of the theatre. What may be surprising here, considering that personal interest is involved, is that the difference was not greater.

The final contrast to be considered is that on item 8. We had rather expected the school administrators to place high value upon deportment items such as this one, which reads, "to teach students how a mature theatregoer should behave at a play." But, although the administrators and drama teachers did rate this objective more highly than the actors or English teachers, it is notable that all four groups rated it below their respective means. The low rating given the objective by actors and English teachers probably stems from the fact that the two groups agreed that the learning of theatre behavior is largely a theatre rather than a classroom matter.

DISCUSSION

One might continue to spin out speculations about why differences exist among the groups on particular items, for not all of the differences that were found have been discussed. But in the case of single items it is wiser not to go too far, since it is a common observation that changing the wording of an item even slightly may cause it to elicit quite different responses.

One is on firmer ground dealing with responses to an entire instrument or to a group of conceptually related items, such as the factors we have discussed. We would suggest that the analyses reported above permit us to draw three conclusions with some confidence.

First, the four groups studied do, as anticipated, differ in the values that they place upon different types of objectives ostensibly attainable through drama or the study of drama. These differences in objectives seem to be related to different understandings of the manifestly ambiguous term *drama*.

Second, the groups are most clearly discriminated by their responses to the items in Factors 1, "Noncognitive personal development," and 2, "Ethical growth." The English teachers place significantly lower values upon the Factor 1 objectives, all of which presuppose student engagement in dramatic activities, than do the actors and the other two groups of educators. From this it may be inferred that the English teachers think of drama as most importantly a verbal and literary matter or, at least, that they do not feel it is proper to give a great deal of attention to the nonliterary dimensions of drama in the English classroom.

The English teachers also placed significantly higher value than the other groups on the ethical or philosophical objectives represented by the items in Factor 2. These objectives are among the traditional justifications for a literary education, and the valuing of them by the English teachers is consonant with the emphasis on drama as literature that was inferred from the responses to items in Factor 1.

If the expectation was that the interests and the training of English teachers would be automaticaly congruent with the needs of the theatre, then it may be fair to say that the choice of English teachers as the primary agents for integrating theatre into the curriculum was naive. However, if the expectation was that the responsibility for preparing students for the theatre would force English teachers to examine their own practices and to devise and try out new approaches to drama, that is another matter. And there is considerable evidence that, in many schools, the Educational Laboratory Theatre Project has indeed had the effect of broadening and enriching the English curriculum and introducing new practices, such as improvisation, which require a redefinition of the English teachers' traditional role. Whether these changes are widespread and deep enough to alter the structure of objectives held by English teachers will be the question at issue in a later replication of this study.

The third conclusion that may be drawn is that, despite the differences demonstrated in regard to certain clusters of items the four groups agree highly about the *relative* importance of the educational objectives represented by the items on the questionnaire. The extent of their agreement is described below in two ways.

Table 5 shows the ranks assigned by each group to the 32

Table 5
Ranks Assigned to the Questionnaire
Items by Each of the Four Groups of Respondents

Item No.	English teachers	Drama teachers	Actors	Administrators
1	30	31	27	29
2	31	29	26	22.5
3	16	6	11	3.5
4	21	8.5	13	13.5
5	10	6	1	6.5
6	13	23	15	18
7	17	14.5	10	25
8	26	18	28	20
9	32	30	32	32
10	20	28	18	21
11	9	10	14	10
12	3	1.5	2	1
13	12	11	3.5	9
14	19	13	21	16
15	29	32	31	30
16	11	14.5	23	18
17	24	21	20	22.5
18	18	21	22	18
19	23	25	25	28
20	6	6	12	6.5
21	7	3.5	6	3.5
22	28	24	30	31
23	4	1.5	8	2
24	5	3.5	3.5	8
25	14	21	29	13.5
26	27	26	16	24
27	25	27	19	26
28	22	17	7	12
29	15	19	24	27
30	2	12	9	11
31	8	16	17	15
32	1	8.5	5	5

items. When Kendall's coefficient of concordance W, corrected for tied ranks, is computed for these data, W = .86.[6] W may be used in calculating the average intercorrelation between groups, $\bar{r} = (nW - 1)/(n - 1) = (4(.86) - 1)/(4 - 1) = .81$, a value which allows us to reject the hypothesis that the four sets of ranks are independent, $P<.01$.

A similar procedure, using the mean ratings summarized in columns 1 to 4 in Table 2, utiiizes analysis of variance to estimate the reliability of the measurements. The analysis of variance for these data are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6
Estimate of the Reliability of the Measurements

Source of variation	SS	df	MS
Between items	51.60	31	1.66
Within items	10.75	96	.11
Between groups	9.92	3	3.31
Residual	.83	93	.01
Total	62.35	127	

The variation in column means among the groups (see Table 2) may be taken to represent systematic variations in frame of reference among the groups. Variations due to frame of reference should not be considered as part of the error of measurement. An estimate of reliability adjusted for this systematic variation may be obtained from

$$r_4 = \frac{MS_{\text{between items}} - MS_{\text{residual}}}{MS_{\text{between items}}} = \frac{1.66 - .01}{1.66} = .99.$$

The reliability of a single rating for the adjusted data is given by

$$r_1 = \frac{MS_{\text{between items}} - MS_{\text{within items}}}{MS_{\text{between items}} + (k - 1)(MS_{\text{within items}})} = \frac{1.66 - .11}{1.66 + .33} = .78.$$

[6] See S. Siegel, *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956), pp. 213-239. The reader's attention is called to Siegel's warning (p. 238) that a "high or significant value of W does *not* mean that the orderings observed are *correct*. . . . It is possible that a variety of judges can agree because all employ the 'wrong' criterion." For example, although all the groups rate item 9

This is an approximation of the average intercorrelation between ratings given by pairs of groups.[7]

In either case, it is clear that the significant mean differences among the ratings of the four groups represent departures from a significant pattern of agreement among the groups about the relative importance of the educational objectives represented on the questionnaire. The differences that discriminate among the groups occur within a narrow range of high mean scores (see Table 1) and between sets of ratings that are highly correlated ($P < .01$).

CONCLUSION

The differences in objectives and values that have been described in this study as existing between English teachers and professional actors, as well as between these two groups and drama teachers and school administrators, are basic and important differences, of the sort that influence preferences, decisions, and behaviors. The clear distinction between the groups revealed by the discriminant analysis, and the fact that the description of the differences among groups has evoked the shock of recognition from readers familiar with the problems of school-theatre projects, suggest that the differences are indeed functions of the occupational groupings that were studied. If that is so, the differences are realities that must actively be taken into account by those planning educational programs involving the cooperation of English teachers and professional actors, and by educators contemplating reforms which would require English teachers to begin considering literature and language as basically dramatic in their natures.

However, the finding that the groups are generally in agreement about the relative importance of the various objectives for drama gives reason for expecting that collaboration between the schools and the theatre may be rendered easier and more fruitful if the differences which inhibit communication are honestly faced and frankly discussed. Investigations such as the present one are justified, ultimately, by the practical usefulness of their results in facilitating such collaboration.

("Locate talent") at or near the bottom, it is possible that if the criterion was the social and psychological well-being of students recruited into school dramatics, the item would deserve a very high rating.

7 See the discussion in Winer, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-132.

The "Place of Drama" Questionnaire

Please check one and fill in the appropriate blank.

... School administrator	... Drama teacher
... English teacher	School .....
... Repertory Company member	Location .....

Each of the sentences below expresses a purpose for the inclusion of drama in secondary English curriculum that has been advanced in a published book, article, or curriculum guide. We would like to know what you, personally, think of each of these suggested objectives.

To record your judgment of each statement, circle the symbol to the right of the statement that best expressed the strength of your agreement or disagreement with the statement. The key below explains how each symbol should be interpreted.

Judge each item independently. Work fairly quickly and record your initial reaction to each statement.

KEY

SA (Strongly agree)	*means*	"This is a very important reason and one that should guide the classroom conduct of all English teachers."
A (Agree)	*means*	"This is an important reason, but probably not of primary importance in the average English classroom."
AR (Agree, with reservations)	*means*	"This is a reasonable objective for including drama in the curriculum for some types of English classes."
NO (No opinion)	*means*	
DQ (Disagree, with qualifications)	*means*	"This is not ordinarily an important reason for including drama in the English curriculum."
D (Disagree)	*means*	"This is not an an important reason for including drama in the English curriculum."
SD (Strongly disagree)	*means*	"This is not a legitimate or defensible reason for including drama in the English curriculum."

An important reason for including the drama in a high school English class is:	Strongly agree	Agree	Agree, reservations	No opinion	Disagree, qualifications	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. to encourage students to take part in community dramatics activities.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
2. to develop in students the capacity for moving gracefully, easily, and expressively.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
3. that dramatic activities can help a student develop self-confidence.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
4. to develop in students the habits of cooperation and teamwork.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
5. to engage students in fulfilling and creative activities.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
6. simply that students enjoy dramatic activities.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
7. to stimulate interest in the theatre so that students will become regular patrons of the professional theatre when they are adults.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
8. to teach students how a mature theatregoer should behave at a play.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
9. to locate student talent for school dramatic activities.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
10. to bring life and movement into the classroom.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
11. to help students to grow increasingly sophisticated in their selection of plays to watch and read.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
12. that study of the drama can develop the students' abilities to deal critically with other forms of literature.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
13. to extend the range, fluency, and effectiveness of student speech.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD
14. that play acting in itself is an aesthetic experience that no young person should miss.	SA	A	AR	NO	DQ	D	SD

15. to develop in students the ability to read a play in the way an actor or director reads it. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
16. to teach students how to interpret symbolism as used in certain types of plays. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
17. to give students a thorough understanding of the history and development of the theatre. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
18. to give students a mastery of the critical vocabulary necessary to an intelligent discussion of dramatic literature. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
19. that great dramas provide many excellent topics for composition assignments. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
20. to familiarize students with the different types of drama—tragedy, comedy, farce, melodrama, and so on. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
21. to improve the students' taste in entertainment. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
22. to acquaint the students with the technical aspects of theatrical production. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
23. to help students to learn how to become more perceptive members of the audience at a play. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
24. to give students experiences that will enable them to appreciate other great works of art. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
25. to develop in students a distaste for the cheap and shoddy and sensational in art and literature. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
26. that such study can help students to understand European and American history more thoroughly. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
27. that dramatic activities such as improvisation are excellent preparation for creative writing assignments. SA A AR NO DQ D SD
28. that drama, and especially Shakespeare, provides a wealth of examples for study of language and linguistic change. SA A AR NO DQ D SD

29. that drama provides moral lessons from which students can learn how to better order their own lives. SA A AR NO DQ D SD

30. to give students a deeper understanding of their own motives and of human nature in general. SA A AR NO DQ D SD

31. to help students develop a philosophy of life through contact with "the best thoughts of the best minds." SA A AR NO DQ D SD

32. that, by perceiving the world through the senses of persons unlike themselves, students will develop tolerance and a deeper understanding of the human condition. SA A AR NO DQ D SD